DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 334 024 PS 019 769

TITLE Round Table on the Complementarity of Formal and Non-Formal Approaches at the Primary Education Level (Hamburg, Germany, October 1-4, 1990). Final Report.

INSTITUTION United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, Hamburg (Germany). Inst. for Education.

PUB DATE Oct 90

NOTE 27p.

PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.

DESCRIPTORS *Access to Education; Adult Basic Education; Developing Nations; Educational Policy; *Elementary Education; Equal Education; Foreign Countries; *Illiteracy; International Cooperation; *Nonformal Education; *Nonschool Educational Programs; Refugees; *School Community Relationship; Womens Education

IDENTIFIERS West Germany (Hamburg)

ABSTRACT

This report summarizes the deliberations and presents the proposals which were the products of a UNESCO-sponsored round table conference. Representatives from 15 countries and several regional and international organizations attended the conference. The objectives and expected outcomes of the conference are listed, and its organization and development are described. The proposed agenda and some guiding questions for discussion are listed. The initial plenary session debated several issues, including the flexible approach of nonformal education, the eradication of illiteracy and the universalization of education, and the education of girls and women. Working groups analyzed specific themes, including allocation of resources, training of teachers, and the specific characteristics of nonformal education that have contributed to its effectiveness. Recommendations for the consideration of member states were made, on such topics as: (1) national policy commitment to nonformal approaches to education; (2) materials and methods for both formal and nonformal education; (3) publicity and public relations on behalf of the need for nonformal approaches; and (4) community participation and self-management. Areas for further research were suggested. Special recommendations concerning women and children were made. A list of participants is included. The opening address by A. V. Ordonex, which is partly in English and partly in French and asserts that everyone has a right to education, is also provided. (BC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED334024

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

A Joint Project of ED/BAS
Unesco, Paris
and UIE, Hamburg

Unesco Institute for Education
Feldbrunnenstrasse 58
2000 Hamburg 13
Germany

ROUND TABLE ON THE COMPLEMENTARITY OF FORMAL AND NON-FORMAL APPROACHES AT THE PRIMARY EDUCATION LEVEL

Hamburg, 1 - 4 October 1990

FINAL REPORT

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
F. Zanuttini
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PS 019769

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1. BACKGROUND

Eradication of illiteracy and provision of a basic level of education for all has been a major concern of Unesco as reflected in the Second Medium Term Plan (1984-1989) and through its Major Programme II, Education for All, attempts were made on a global scale to promote general access to education to eradicate illiteracy and to provide a satisfactory level of initial education to all. This attempt is being continued and further stressed in the Third Medium Term Plan (1990-1995) in Programme 1.1: Towards Basic Education for All.

Under the Approved Programme and Budget for 1990-1991 (sub-programme 1.1.2.) one of the activities envisaged by Unesco was to organize a round table for the examination and analysis of the principles of action designed to promote the complementarity of non-formal fundamental education activities and formal primary education. This perspective was strongly endorsed by the World Conference on Education for All, (Jomtien, Thailand, March, 1990).

Accordingly, the Round Table on the Complementarity of Formal and Nonformal Approaches at the Primary Education Level was organized jointly by Unesco, Paris and the Unesco Institute for Education (UIE), Hamburg and held at UIE from 1 to 4 October 1990.

The present report summarizes the deliberations and presents the suggestions and proposals which were the product of the Round Table.

2. PARTICIPANTS

Twenty specialists selected on the basis of their experience and expertise in activities related to the theme of the Round Table from different countries and organizations participated in the Round Table. Their diverse cultural and institutional background and variety of experiences were an important element which contributed to enrich the quality of the discussions.

The country-wise representation was as follows: 4 from Asia (Bangladesh, India, Sri Lanka and Thailand); 5 from Africa (Algeria, Burkina Faso, Niger, Nigeria and Sudan); 2 from Latin America (Colombia and Mexico); and 4 from Europe (Belgium, Hungary, Switzerland and the United Kingdom).

Representatives from several regional and international organizations also took part in the Round Table as observers. They were from PROAP/UNESCO, CELC, CMOPE/WCOTP and UNHCR. A researcher from Bolivia also attended the meeting as an observer. Of the total number of participants only 4 were women. (A full list of participants and observers is given in Annex 1).

3. OBJECTIVES AND EXPECTED OUTCOMES

The objectives of the meeting were:

1. To examine and analyse experiences in nonformal and non-conventional approaches with a view to acquiring a better understanding of the principles of action needed to promote and develop nonformal basic education.

2. To make proposals and suggestions for generating and developing alternative nonformal approaches to basic education for all, particularly for out-of-school children and youth.

3. To make proposals for further research

The expected results of this meeting were therefore:

(a) a more precise knowledge of activities and programmes in progress, their impact, the difficulties encountered, the constraints identified, and the lessons to be learnt with regard to their generalization in the countries concerned or their transposition to other countries;

(b) practical suggestions useful to decision-makers, planners and teacher educators;

(c) proposals for research and experiments designed to investigate more thoroughly the most significant and conclusive approaches; and

(d) views concerning the most effective ways of creating awareness of non-formal approaches and of the advantages of their adoption as a cohesive complement to formal schooling.

4. **ORGANIZATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE MEETING**

4.1. Reference documents were sent in advance to the participants to help them prepare themselves for the discussions. These constituted a common reference to start the dialogue, which was further developed during the meeting. (See Annex 3 for list of documents)

4.2. At the commencement of the meeting Mr Paul Bélanger, Director, UIE welcomed the participants. Mr Anthony Ordonez, Director of the Division of Basic Education, Unesco, Paris declared open the Round Table on behalf of the Director General of UNESCO. He referred to the right to education of all human beings through an appropriate delivery system including alternative options provided that they share the same standards of quality applied to formal schooling and are adequately supported, as recognized in the World Declaration of Education for All. He pointed out Nonformal Education as a complementary stream for meeting the needs of the out-of-school children, youth and adults who should benefit from a variety of options offered. After referring to the obstacles encountered for recognizing nonformal education as an appropriate approach, he invited the participants to share their knowledge and experience and examine the main components of innovative experiences and to establish interrelations and finally make relevant suggestions and proposals for follow-up actions. (See annex 2).
Mr A Hamadache, ED/BAS, Unesco, Paris outlined the Unesco programme and activities in universalization of primary education and emphasized the significance of this Round Table for future action.

4.3. The following persons were elected to the bureau of the Round Table:

Chairman : Mr Omar Skander (Algeria)
Vice-Chairpersons : Ms Usha Nayar (India)
and Chairpersons : Mr Adda Mahamane (Niger
of Working groups
General Rapporteur : Ms Mercy Abreu de Armengol (Colombia)
Rapporteur Group I : " " " "
Rapporteur group II: Ms Amon Yvette (UIE)

4.4. At the initial plenary session the proposed objectives were considered and approved and the problems related to the twofold approach suggested for the eradication of illiteracy and provision of basic education to all were raised (see section 5). The discussion on the concept of nonformal education and its potential for contributing to the aim of education for all, as well as the limitations or obstacles which have arisen in its implementation, suggested the need for further clarification in group work.

Two working groups were formed on the basis of the two languages spoken by the participants - English and French. In addition to the topic of the Round Table, two other related issues were brought to the consideration of the participants.

(i) the UIE project proposal on nonformal primary education as a follow-up of the World Conference on Education for All (WCEFA) - "Development of Appropriate Learning/Teaching Strategies in Nonformal Primary Education for Out-of-School Learners"; and

(ii) a consultation on relevant issues related to adult basic nonformal education to be pursued by UNESCO and UIE.

5. **THE CONTENTS**

5.1. The proposed agenda included the following points for discussion in plenary sessions and group work:

- Identification of <u>issues</u> (plenary session):

  § Recent trends in demand and needs.
  § Obstacles to the development of non-formal fundamental education.
  § New approaches.

- The different <u>components</u> of non-formal fundamental education programmes and projects, in the light of some national cases and the experience of participants (group work):

  § Target groups and their needs.
  § Objectives.
  § Structures, programmes and methods.
  § Personnel (teaching and non-teaching) and their training.
  § Organization and management.
  § Evaluation.

- The elements of structures and planning:

  § Relationship between non-formal activities and the formal education system.
  § Identification of needs: from diagnosis to objectives.
  § Decentralization and participation: educational mapping.
  § Problems relating to costs and the optimization of resources.
  § The planning of non-formal education and its limits. Co-ordination and articulation of formal and non-formal education: equivalences, linkages, resources, etc. The alternative dimension of the non-formal approach and its recognition by the educational and working world.

- Regional and international co-operation.

5.2. Main aspects to be considered in nonformal education for out-of-school learners.

In order to focus the debate, Mr Mahinda Ranaweera presented the main points of the reference documents and raised some issues and guiding questions for discussion:

1. The problem:

   (a) Providing access to and effective participation in primary education opportunities for all children (6-10 years)

   (b) Primary education equivalence courses for youth and adults seeking a second chance.

2. Legal status and policy:

   (a) To what extent do national/federal constitutions/ legislation reflect this obligation?

   (b) Do policy makers have a correct perspective of the solution? Do they envisage the dissemination of a tradition package to cover larger sections of the population or identify and develop new structures/content/methodologies that can be profitably universalized?

3. Criteria for universalization:

   (a) Does it involve only the qualitative achievement of universal enrolment or both quantitative and qualitative dimensions of primary education?

   (b) Do policy makers have reliable data on the quantitative and qualitative aspects for all categories and age groups?

4. Limitations of the formal system:

   (a) Why has the attempt to achieve UPE through the formal system failed?

   (b) Have adequate measures been taken to tackle the problems of poverty, social and cultural deprivations and geographical obstacles on the one hand, and the relevance of the curriculum on the other?

5. Advantages of the nonformal approaches:

   Can we identify significant cases and experiences and generalized examples of innovative aproaches?

6. Planning:

   Can nonformal primary education be effectively planned? If so, how, by whom? At the national level or both?

7. Place of nonformal approaches in the overall system of education:

   (a) Should nonformal education remain as a cheap substitute or should it be considered as a component of the whole integrated concept of the educational system, existing in equal partnership with the formal system?

   (b) Is it possible to conceive of formal, nonformal and informal education as building blocks of a comprehensive learning network?

8. Quality improvement:

   Should the formal primary school and its curriculum be taken as the model? If not, what new strategies should be adopted?

9. Personnel:

   What measures should be taken to improve training, conditions of employment, status, remuneration, etc. of various categories of personnel involved?

10. Administration and finance:

    What is the place of nonformal primary education in the total education budget? What other sources of funding are available?

11. Problems of equivalence and accreditation:
    What ways and means could be devised to ensure standards of achievement to meet both learners needs and demands of society (for accreditation purposes)?

5.3. Initial Plenary Debates

A wide range of issues emerged from the participants' experiences in different contexts during the preliminary plenary discussion. These were related to political, historical, social, cultural pedagogical, planning and management and financial dimensions.

The discussion on the need and the potentialities of nonformal education led to a critical preview of the limitations of the formal system and the need to reform formal education was stressed. By demonstrating the advantages of a flexible approach nonformal education should contribute to making formal education less rigid in regard to pedagogical aspects', besides reaching the population who has no access or drop-outs. However, there are many obstacles in developing nonformal approaches, especially, when trying to implement large scale programmes.

The participants pointed out that nonformal education has a major contribution to make to the eradication of illiteracy and univeralization of primary education and that the size of the clientele for nonformal education at the primary level in developing countries is enormous and heterogeneous. It plays a specific role in catering to the needs of a varied clientele: neo-literates; out-of-school children; drop-outs; youths and adults belonging to different groups according to age, sex, location and various types of disadvantaged or underpriviledged situations; and those who have specific learning needs.
The problem is present not only in developing countries but also in the industrialized world where there are different groups of mobile populations (migrants, oppcupational travellers, and in some countries marginal groups such as gypsies) requiring basic level education.

A political will as well as a pedagogical response are necessary in order to meet the needs of the clientele and to overcome the difficulties faced. Some innovations require political decisions (e.g. on the use of existing infrastructures, the allocation of resources particularly for special programmes geared to girls and women, ethnic groups, refugees, nomads; and on the language of instruction).

Special programmes geared to specific hard to reach groups, though more expensive, may have to be developed in order to provide nonformal basic education to the last 10% or 5% of the total population who have special difficulties in benefitting from the formal system.

There is also the need to consider social perceptions and parents' attitudes towards education which may involve traditional cultural patterns, especially related to gender discrimination.

The education of girls and women should be considered from the perspective of the cultural and daily life context. Female education requires support service that would release the girls and women from their daily occupations during the time needed for participating in educational programmes.

Low participation of women in both the formal system and nonformal education activities has been frequently pointed out and a call has been made to develop appropriate programmes for them. Gender discrimination should also be overcome at the administrative level by increasing the number of female teachers and women involved in educational management. Women's education has mostly been planned by men from the men's points of view. It was recommended that in meetings like the present Round Table women should have a larger representation.

The different experiences referred to by each of the participants showed the variety of situations which may take recourse to nonformal education approaches, on the basis of the deversified and flexible nature of this approach not only in structures, but in pedagogical methods as well. No uniform models, particularly those in the formal system should be adopted, and care should be taken to prevent nonformal education becoming formalized.

5.4. Specific Focus on Selected Issues.

Organized in two Working Groups the participants analysed specific themes outlined in the discussion guidelines, a summary of which follows.

Nonformal education is confronted with certain obstacles which hinder its development, and certain remedial measures and conditions are necessary to overcome these. The main condition refers to the allocation of necessary resources for providing a

quality education comparable to that obtaining in the formal system. Costs have to be considered according to particular situations, whether a problem of reaching masses of out-of-school learners or specific groups in remote areas, with special characteristics (e.g. nomads) or situational problems (refugees, migrants, occupational travellers). The appropriate utilization of resources e.g. in providing suitable infra-structure and relevant educational programmes, is another important factor for reaching the target population in an effective manner.

Participation of the learners concerned is necessary if nonformal education is to be relevant to their needs. A needs-oriented curriculum should emerge from the assessment done at the community level, stressing functional needs for coping with daily life problems.

The teaching/learning strategies should be flexible, preferably promoting group learning and peer-tutoring even when using self-instruction material. It is desirable to develop a horizontal type of relationship between the teacher/ instructor/facilitator and the learner and a type of evaluation more in accordance with the nonformal approach, including self-evaluation, and evaluation by peers in a stress free atmosphere, avoiding the traditional use of examinations which should not become the main concern in nonformal education, in order to enhance the unique characteristics of nonformal education.

The training of teachers and all the personnel involved in nonformal education programmes requires special attention if good quality education is to be provided and recognition gained in comparison to the formal system in order to attain equivalence. Teachers coming from the formal school system need some reorientation for using nonformal approaches in education. Fresh recruits with only 10 or 12 years of schooling should be provided with adequate initial training and both should benefit from a continuous in-service training and professional support for a more effective performance of their roles and tasks. Different agencies should be involved in the training of personnel.

The lower status and remuneration of nonformal education personnel as compared to those from the formal system have often been an obstacle for the development of nonformal education and enhancing its contribution.

A variety of structures in nonformal education should be promoted to suit different and heterogenous groups of learners. Thus, flexibility and adaptability are necessary for meeting the requirements of various groups. Decentralization of activities related to organization and management, involving community participation was deemed essential for reaching a wider cientele. There is also need for coordinated action among different agencies involved, both governmental and nongovernmental.

Some persistent issues remained to be further analyzed such as the capacity of nonformal education to reach large numbers of out-of-school learners. As regards the costs of nonformal education compared to those of the formal system, there is a danger of perceiving nonformal education as a cheap substitute and neglecting the need to consider the size of the population to be served and the quality and effectiveness of the learning experiences.

This leads to the important issue of recognizing equivalence of nonformal education in terms of the levels of learning, accepting its equality and opening channels for re-entry, if necessary, into the formal stream of education. The need for strong political support for this purpose was stressed. It relates to the recognition of and support for the nonformal approach as a viable and advantageous alternative for those people who have no access to the formal system or as a second chance for those who have dropped out prematurely. Some form of equivalence with the formal system and building bridges for passing from nonformal education to the formal system and vice versa are also required. It was stressed that nonformal education should be developed as an alternative and parallel system in its own right and should no longer be considered as a cheap and inferior substitute for 'real' education.

The issue of mobilizing the demand for nonformal education, which relates to the motivation of participants and transformation of unfavourable social perceptions of parents

and the community requires greater attention than has been given till now.

The specific characteristics of nonformal approaches which have contributed to its effectiveness, such as its flexibility, diversity, functionality, culturally rooted nature, decentralization, permitting alternance with work, etc. should continue to be emphasized in order to avoid a tendency towards more and more formalization.

Finally, as regards the complementarity between formal and nonformal approaches emphasis was made on the need to reform the formal system using appropriate innovative practices based on some of the specific characteristics of the nonformal system mentioned above, and perhaps use nonformal situations for experimenting innovations which could also result in creating an awareness of the need to introduce similar innovations in the formal school. A dynamic of interchange of experiences between the two systems should be fostered as a part of the building of bridges across the two approaches.

It was emphasized that there would be no intention to pinpoint one single "best way" but to advocate a multifaceted diversified approach, leading to provide quality education to all.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS AND PROPOSALS

6.1. The following recommendations and proposals were made to be considered by Member States and regional and international organizations for enhancing the contribution of nonformal education to the objectives of education for all.

(1) Based on the adherence by Member States of Unesco to the declaration and recommendations of the Jomtien Conference, procuring a policy commitment at the national level for development of nonformal approaches as a viable alternative to the formal system.

(2) Conducting research on different aspects of nonformal education, which may provide the necessary elements for enhancing the credibility of programme/project proposals (see sections 6.2 and 6.3 for details)

(3) Development of materials and methods which could be jointly used by both formal and nonformal education programmes.

(4) Creation of awareness of the need for nonformal approaches through publicity and public relations which present the true picture of education in the country.

Emphasis must be made on the need for providing educational opportunities to girls and women and for complementing parents' and childrens' education.

(5) Sensitization and orientation of parents and children in order to create a more favourable perception and positive attitudes towards education and nonformal education in particular and motivate them to participate.

(6) Introducing continuous processes of collecting data on nonformal education and taking action to periodically review the uptake of the children participating in nonformal education programmes and enhance the external efficiency. This requires on-going evaluation procedures for assessing how these programmes are meeting the specific needs and expectations of the individual, the community and the society. It also requires the development of criteria such as re-entry to the formal system or vocational training programmes, obtaining gainful employment, etc. Followup processes may indicate how to develop further and obtain a greater multiplier effect from nonformal education.

(7) Promoting links and co-operation between the formal and nonformal systems which may lead to learning from the successful experiences of each.

This could result in making the formal system less rigid in order to build bridges and reduce the gaps, to establish links between the school and agencies outside and assuming responsibilities.

(8) Examination of historical and socio-cultural impediments and factors associated with the formal education system, particularly in relation to gender discrimination, the elitist concept of education, the abstract nature and limited objectives of the formal primary education system, the neutralization of curricula and assessment procedures based on examinations in order to overcome the impediments for the development of nonformal education approaches.

(9) Providing special assistance to first generation learners (coming from illiterate environments, illiterate parents), the creation of a literate

environment where the newly acquired knowledge and skills are useful and ensuring continuity in educational opportunities.

(10) Adopting a decentralized approach for the organization and management of programmes which carries the implication of the loss of power by central bureaucracies.

Community participation should be encouraged for enhancing self-reliance, developing community initiatives and self-management at the grassroots level, to which the involvement of NGOs may make a valuable contribution.

(11) Recognizing the need to adopt a differentiated approach as opposed to an 'all-embracing' approach in order to meet the needs of specific target groups.

(12) Adopting networking mechanisms among national and international agencies to avoid duplication of efforts and optimize combined resources.

(13) Promoting a gender inclusive policy by involving at least 50% of women participants at all levels in the implementation of nonformal education programmes.

6.2. Concrete proposals for research and development action were stated as follows:

1) To compile an inventory of existing experiences according to specific target groups.

2) To carry out critical observations of selected experiences by international agencies, including elements such as structures, curriculum, strategies, coordination, obstacles and transferability of the experiences.

3) To organize exchange oportunities (South-South, North-North, South-North) for sharing the knowledge and experience gained in NFE, on the basis of existing programmes with similar target groups, and structures in order to examine and compare the ways of attaining flexibility, the learning strategies and materials, the obstacles encountered, etc.

(a) mobile groups, (b) traditional schools such as Koranic and Pagoda schools, (c) single class/ multigrade class situations.

4) To request Unesco Regional Offices in Asia and the Pacific, Africa, Arab States, Latin America and the Caribbean to:

(a) carry out co-operative country-based research and action programmes on complementarity, co-ordination and linkages between formal and nonformal education in their regions.

(b) conduct national and regional workshops for training of personnel and for producing appropriate learning materials and developing evaluation approaches for nonformal primary education for out-of-school learners.

6.3. Some areas suggested for research are:

(1) The potential contribution of nonformal education to the achievement of UPE by the year 2000 on a complementary basis with formal education

(2) Comparative studies on appropriate models for better coordination and cooperation mechanisms between formal and nonformal education in order to promote UPE by the year 2000.

(3) Investigations on the theoretical basis for the preparation of teaching-learning materials suitable for learners learning under special circumstances with emphasis on the processes involved.

(4) The role of NFE as operated by NGOs.

(5) Further research on evaluation of learners and programmes, including equivalence mechanisms with the formal stream and comparative studies of primary school graduates from the formal and non formal streams and its impact on their lives.

(6) Diagnosis and assessment of educational needs of children of underprivileged/disadvantaged population groups in order to develop NFE programmes, methodologies and materials.

(7) Studies on the participation of girls and women in nonformal education and its impact in their status.

(8) Further research on the concept and the theory of NFE by universities and research organizations.

(9) Problems and issues related to language and the medium of instruction.

The following special recommendations were made by the delegate of UNHCR:

1) In countries where refugees are located, necessary linkages within governments must be ensured between the Ministry of Education who are responsible for primary,

nonformal and vocational education, and those ministries who assume responsibilities for the planning and managing of those refugees.

2) The provision of basic education for refugee children in both the formal and nonformal education streams must be shared through the cooperation among host country governments, NGOs, and international organizations. Specialist interagency coordination mechanisms must be developed in order to meet the diverse and widespread needs of the refugee population.

3) Special literacy programmes for refugee women which address elements related to health, childcare, nutrition, sanitation, etc. must be developed in concert with the national programmes of the host countries.

4) Special case studies must be conducted on refugee girls' access to schools and other nonformal educational programmes.

5) In the national training schemes related to Nonformal education programmes, participation by members of the following groups must be included:

- refugees, in particular, women
- members of the refugee education committees
- implementing partners of UNHCR programmes, NGO's and members of the ministries of education.

A Joint Project of ED/BAS,
Unesco Paris
and UIE, Hamburg

Annex 1

Unesco Institute for Education
Feldbrunnenstrasse 58
2000 Hamburg 13
Federal Republic of Germany

ROUND TABLE ON THE COMPLEMENTARITY
OF FORMAL AND NON-FORMAL APPROACHES
AT THE PRIMARY EDUCATION LEVEL

Hamburg, 1-4 October 1990

REVISED LIST OF PARTICIPANTS
LIST REVISEE DES PARTICIPANTS

Algeria/Algerie

M. Omar Skander
Inspecteur Général de l'Education
Cité de l'Orangeraie
Ben-Aknoun
Alger

Bangladesh

Dr Muhammad Nurul Haq
Adviser
Bangladesh University Grants Commission
Sher-E-Bangla Nagar
Dhaka

Belgium/Belgique

M. Ludo Knaepkens
Directeur
European Federation for the Education of Children of Occupational Travellers (EFECOT)
rue de l'Industrie 42/10
B-1040 Brussels

Burkino Faso

Dr Zalle Poko Moctar
Conseiller Technique du Ministre de l'Enseignement de Base et de l'Alphabétisation de Masse (MEBAM)
03 PB 7032
Ouagadougou 03

Colombia/Colombie

Ms Mercy Abreu de Armengol

Profesional-Sección Planeación, Investigación y Evaluación
Dirección General de Educación de Adultos
Ministerio de Educación Nacional
Ave El Dorado CAN
Bogotá

Hongrie/Hungary

M. Elemér Várnagy

Université Janus Pannonius
Sallai Imre u. 42
H-7624 Pecs

India/Inde

Professor Usha Nayar

Head
Department of Women's Studies
National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT)
Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi 110016

Mexico/Mexique

M. Fabio Angel Espinosa Soriano

Directeur d'Education Primaire(2)
Ministère d'Education Publique
Calle Peluqueros y Tizayuca
Col. Michoacana CP
15240 Mexico D F

Niger

M. Adda Mahamane

Secrétaire Général Adjoint
Ministère de l'education nationale
B P 557
Niamey

Nigeria

Professor Chimah Ezeomah

Executive Secretary
National Commission for Nomadic Education
G2 & 4 Badiko Express Road
PMB 2343
Kaduna

Sri Lanka

Mr H S Wijeratne

Education Officer
Nonformal Education
Ministry of Education & Higher Education
'Isurupaya'
Battaramulla

Sudan/Soudan

Mr Mohamed El Hassan Taha

Director of Research Centre
Bakht Er Ruda Institute of Education
P O Box 21
Bakht Er Ruda

Suisse/Switzerland

Professeur Pierre Furter

Université de Genève
Faculté de Psychologie et des Sciences de l'Education
24 rue Général-Dufour
CH-1211 Genève 4

Thailand/Thailande

Dr Tongyoo Kaewsaiha

Director
Planning and Research Division
NFE Department
Ministry of Education
Rachadamnern Avenue
Bangkok 10300

United Kingdom/Royaume Uni

Mr Hugh W R Hawes

University of London
Institute of Education
Department of International and Comparative Education
20 Bedford Way
London WC1H OAL

Observers/Observateurs

CELC

Dr Hilary Perraton
Chief Project Officer
Education Programme
Commonwealth Secretariat
Marlborough House Pall Mall
GB-London SW1Y 5HX

CMOPE/WCOTP

M. Marc-Alain Berberat
Secrétaire général adjoint
CMOPE/WCOTP
5 Avenue du Moulin
CH-1110 Morges

PROAP

Mr Prem Kasaju
Programme Specialist in Developmental Research in Education
Unesco Principal Regional Office for Asia and Pacific
Box 967 Prakanong Post Office
Bangkok 10110
Thailand

UNHCR	Ms Marilyn Blaeser Senior Education Officer c/o UNHCR Room 144 154 Rue de Lausanne Centre William Rappard CH-Geneva
Chercheur/Researcher	Mme Julia Ramirez-Castro 29 rue Paul Fort F-75014 Paris
UNESCO	Mr Ali Hamadache ED/PLA UNESCO 7 place de Fontenoy F-75700 Paris
	Mr Anthony Victor Ordonez Director Division of Basic Education UNESCO
	Mr A Tay Programme Specialist Unit for Co-operation with Unicef and WFP UNESCO
UIE/IUE	Dr Paul Bélanger (Director/Directeur) Professor Gottfried Hausmann Dr Jean-Paul Hautecoeur Dr Adama Ouane Mr A Mahinda Ranaweera Mr Peter James Sutton Ms Amon Yvette
Interpreters/Interpretes	Mr George Drummond M. Henri Samama

Annex 2

Table ronde sur la complémentarité des méthodes formelles et non formelles au niveau de l'enseignement primaire

Round Table on the Complementarity of Formal and Non-Formal Approaches at the Primary Education Level

Hambourg, 1-4 octobre 1990 / Hamburg 1-4 October 1990

Allocution d'ouverture de M. A.V. Ordonez
Directeur de la Division de l'éducation de base
Unesco

Opening Address by Mr A.V. Ordonez
Director, Division of Basic Education
Unesco

Monsieur le Directeur et Cher Ami,

Mes chers collègues,

More than 40 years ago, the nations of the world asserted, through the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, that "everyone has a right to education". Despite the efforts by all the countries around the world to ensure this fundamental right, the access to schooling is not yet fully available to all in many developing countries. Those children who are not integrated into the formal school system should no longer remain outside the learning system and, as it was recommended by the ministers of education at the forty-second session of the International Conference of Education, "the setting up of non-formal, non-conventional, innovative and flexible structures is a positive response to the formal system, provided that such structures are not of a lower standard than those in the formal schools, which they should complement".

"Every child, youth and adult shall be able to benefit from educational opportunities designed to meet their basic learning needs", proclaimed also the World Declaration on Education for All adopted in March 1990. By recalling the right of education for all peoples, women and men, of all ages, throughout the world, the participants in the World Conference on Education for All in Jomtien, reaffirmed that "the main delivery system for the basic education of children outside the family is primary schooling, aware, nevertheless, of the fact that supplementary alternative programmes can help meet the basic learning needs of children with limited or no access to formal schooling, provided that they share the same standards of learning applied to schools and are adequately supported". They recognized also that the basic

learning needs of youth and adults, as they are diverse, should be met through a variety of delivery systems and can be served by formal as well as non-formal education programmes. Therefore, if it should be quite clear that the democratic demand for equality of access and equality of opportunity means that all children of every country should receive appropriate formal schooling, the fact must be also accepted that the school is no longer considered as the only place where people are educated, and it can no longer claim to be alone in assuming the educational functions of society. Furthermore, the possibilities of learning comprise many and varied factors which cannot be considered as being embodied in a single system managed and controlled by a single central authority. Education no longer depends solely on the authorities responsible for the national education system alone; other services and institutions are also involved, mainly those working in the field of development.

On the other hand, education and learning are no longer considered as synonymous with school attendance, even though many parents still equate "education" with "school"; they are concerned with the "certificate" which they expect the school to deliver in order to enable the holder to obtain employment - which moreover is becoming increasingly hypothetical. This identification of learning with in-school education is still firmly fixed in the minds of many parents; but, at the same time, in facing the school's failure to come up to the hopes they have pinned in it, the wave of discontent and criticism where existing school systems are concerned is steadily monting and is becoming a subject of concern.

Il faut dire aussi que *l'éducation non formelle a eu et a encore* sesdétracteurs. Tout d'abord, on note une certaine résistance - et parfois de l'hostilité - de la part des professionnels de l'éducation contre ce qu'ils considèrent comme une ingérence de non enseignants dans un domaine qu'ils estiment leur être réservé. L'inertie des systèmes éducatifs traditionnels contribue à conforter cette attitude. Certains vont jusqu'à penser que l'éducation non formelle - dans la mesure où elle entend se substituer à l'éducation formelle - nuit à l'équité, car elle ne donne à tous les mêmes chances de succès dans l'éducation. Souvent d'ailleurs, l'absence de statut la fait considérer comme une éducation au rabais, de second ordre. En fait, les critiques d'expériences éducatives non formelles prennent comme point de référence les normes du système formel, alors même que c'est souvent en réaction à ces normes que ces expériences ont été initiées. Enfin, il nous faut noter également que les expériences d'éducation non formelle sont mal connues des pouvoirs publics, d'autant plus qu'elles sont le fait d'organisations non gouvernementales ou d'associations locales. Le document de référence, préparé par l'Institut de l'Unesco pour l'éducation, présente quelques-unes de ces approches novatrices, d'envergure plus ou moins limitée. A la lumière des tendances observées et à travers l'examen de ces approches comme de vos propres expériences, vous en analyserez les principales composantes et leurs interrelations en vue, d'une part, d'en dégager la problématique et, d'autre part, de faire des propositions et des suggestions concrètes tant pour les décideurs, les planificateurs et les formateurs que pour des activités pertinentes de suivi susceptibles

d'être inscrites au prochain Programme et Budget de l'Unesco. Mon collègue, Paul Bélanger, vous donnera de plus amples informations sur les objectifs, les résultats attendus et les modalités d'organisation des travaux de cette réunion, travaux qui seront, j'en suis certain, fructueux et utiles.

Bon succès à cette table ronde et merci à vous tous de m'accepter comme participant à vos travaux.

LIST OF DOCUMENTS

1. Discussion Guidelines

2. Innovative Approaches to Achieving Universal Primary Education and its Democratization by A Mahinda Ranaweera

3. Nonformal and Alternative Approaches to Provide Primary Level Education for Out-of-School Children: A Synthesis of six case studies from Bangladesh, Burundi, Colombia, India, Pakistan and Sri Lanka by Mercy Abreu de Armengol